



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lock more sinned against than sinning, but rather a struggle between Jewish and Elizabethan Christian ideals of life (Justice vs. Mercy). Othello is the tragedy not of intrigue but of an incongruous marriage between a wilful, indiscreet, romantic white girl and a black whose pride had been outraged. Lear is a tragedy of despotism. Absolute rule had had its moral effect on the character of the old king. "In acquiring unlimited sovereignty over his dominion and over his family, he had completely lost sovereignty over himself." The tragedy of his experience illustrates the working out of moral justice. Again the dramatist "shows a sublime faith in the moral order, and in its certainty to bring ultimate triumph to right." Whether we accept these views or not, we cannot deny that they are intelligible and defensible on the grounds of common sense. The author pays a sincere tribute to the dramatist when he says that "the centuries of criticism have veered hither and thither in their judgments, but now show a tendency to come back to Shakespeare, and to accept whatever is manifestly the opinion of the dramatist."

To the valuable Shakespeare number of *Edda* Professor W. B. Cairns of the University of Wisconsin contributes a comprehensive sketch of the vogue of Shakespeare in America, discussing first, briefly, the editions,¹⁴ secondly, the study of Shakespeare in American schools, and thirdly, the acting of Shakespeare on the American stage. He concludes with some notes on the American celebrations of 1864 and on those which were about to be held in 1916. From his remarks and from the studies we have discussed above we get the impression that America, while she has made no startlingly brilliant contribution to Shakespearean scholarship, and while we ought to be thoroughly ashamed of her share in the Baconian controversy, has nevertheless figured respectably in the study and the acting of the great plays; and that our present interest in these activities, intellectual and artistic, gives promise for the future.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

WILLIAM HAUGHTON'S "ENGLISHMEN FOR MY MONEY, OR A WOMAN WILL HAVE HER WILL." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Albert Croll Baugh. Philadelphia, 1917. 8vo, pp. 224.

In spite of its title this doctoral dissertation is much more than a mere edition of William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*; it is a thorough study of an early Elizabethan playwright, who, though unimportant for his extant work, was in his day a conspicuous figure in the dramatic world, and a collaborator with

¹⁴A curious misprint is found on p. 192; the editor of the Variorum was not Henry but Horace Howard Furness.

some of the best craftsmen then writing for the stage. By thus clearing up one corner of the great field of the Elizabethan drama, the book places students of English literature under a considerable debt of gratitude.

With admirable clearness, the Introduction assembles and interprets the scanty facts of Haughton's life, and sketches the history of his brief but active career as a dramatist. Of his life very little is known. Dr. Baugh's conscientious attempt to identify the family of the playwright among the hundreds of Haughtons then living in London has proved unavailing. We are thus dependent upon the scattered entries in Henslowe's *Diary*, and upon Haughton's will, recently discovered by Mr. Wallace and here first printed. Haughton's earliest appearance in the *Diary* is on November 5, 1597; and since Henslowe refers to him as "yonge horton," we may suppose that he had just begun to write for the stage. He died in 1605. His activity as a dramatist, therefore, seems to have been confined to eight years. Our record of this activity, however, is limited to the five years, 1599-1602, that he was working for Henslowe, and only to portions of those five years. The first series of payments made to him (in November, 1597, and February and May, 1598) relates, it seems, to one play, *Englishmen for My Money*; and after the last recorded payment for that play he disappears from sight for one year and three months.¹ But in August, 1599, he reappears in the *Diary*, and begins to work regularly for Henslowe. At first he wrote mainly in collaboration with Henslowe's other and probably more experienced dramatists, Day, Chettle, Dekker, and Smith; but after April, 1600, he began to write for the most part without assistance. His period of servitude to Henslowe came to an end in November, 1601. Eleven months later, indeed, he returned to sell a single play, of which he was the sole author, entitled *William Cartwright*; but this is the last notice of him in the *Diary*. During the remainder of his life he must have been composing plays for other theatrical managers. We cannot imagine that he ceased writing entirely, for like the rest of Henslowe's hacks, he was impecunious; we know that at one time at least he was imprisoned for debt, and reduced to the necessity of begging Henslowe for the loan of ten shillings "to releace hime owt of the clyncke." If for these other managers he labored as industriously as he did for Henslowe, he must have produced a large number of plays, some of them, no doubt, in collaboration. That a few of these plays are extant can hardly be questioned; yet the task of identifying them would be difficult, for Haughton's style not only lacks distinctiveness, but conforms in general to the style of the Henslowe school of writers

¹ Dr. Baugh states this correctly on page 17, but in beginning Section III he incorrectly writes: "After an interval of six months from the date of the last recorded payment on *Englishmen for My Money*, Haughton began, in November, 1599, to work with Day."

with which he was for so long associated. His death occurred on or very shortly after June 6, 1605. His will, made *in extremis*, reveals that he left behind him a widow and children: "I doe giue all my goodes, chattels, and debtbes, whatsoeuer, vnto my wif, Alice Haughton, towards the payment of my debtbes and the bringing vp of my children." The chief witness of his will, and apparently a friend in time of trouble, was the well-known dramatist Wentworth Smith, with whom he had several times collaborated.

The perplexing problems connected with Haughton's numerous lost plays—problems which Fleay's erratic scholarship has made more perplexing—are handled with an independence of judgment, and yet with a scholarly conservatism, that gives one confidence in the results. The reviewer cannot take up in detail the separate discussions of these problems; he desires, however, to single out for special notice the discussion of the authorship of *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, in which Dr. Baugh takes issue with both Fleay and Greg. The argument is clear and forcible, and leaves very little doubt as to the main contention, namely, that Haughton had no share whatever in the composition of that crude play.

The second part of the dissertation consists of a reprint of *Englishmen for My Money*. Of this play we have already two modernized editions in *The Old English Drama* (1830) and Hazlitt's Dodsley (1874), a photographic reproduction of the British Museum copy of the first quarto in Farmer's *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (1911), and an exact type-reproduction of the first quarto in the Malone Society's *Reprints* (1913). The justification for the present edition lies in its recording in minute detail a collation of no less than four copies of the first quarto (the White and Barton copies in America, the British Museum copy through Farmer's facsimile, and the Bodleian copy as collated by Greg), two copies of the second quarto, five copies of the third quarto, and the modern reprints mentioned above. Thus we have in this edition a textual study of the play that should be definitive.

The Notes, which constitute the third part of the dissertation, are, to be frank, disappointing. In the first place they are few, yet the play needs careful and full elucidation. In the second place, those that are given are not always satisfactory. One does not, for example, like the tone of this:

887. *So-la-men . . . etc.* The 1830 editor notes "Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris," but I cannot locate the quotation.

The quotation, I believe, is an anonymous proverb (possibly suggested by a line in Seneca) which, with many similar proverbs, appears in hundreds of instances in the literature of all the countries of Europe. Its popularity in England was probably due to its inclusion in Lilly's well-known Latin grammar. It appears in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, scene V, line 42, in Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sinnen of London*, and elsewhere in Elizabethan literature.

These facts were not hard to ascertain. It is to be regretted that this section of the dissertation does not attain the high standard set by the earlier sections. It is only fair to add that the slighting of the Notes seems to have been intentional. We may hope, therefore, that Dr. Baugh will yet find occasion adequately to elucidate the text he has so carefully reproduced.

In conclusion the reviewer desires to protest against the absence of an index. In a detailed scholarly study like this, which touches in an important way upon many plays and many authors (for a notable example see page 12, note 3) the lack of an index is a serious defect. Possibly the fault lies not so much with Dr. Baugh as with the general editors of the University of Pennsylvania theses. Wherever it lies, one cannot help regretting that in a series so valuable to scholars as this, the inclusion of an index should not be a matter of course.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS.

Cornell University.

*WILLIAM DUNLAP: A STUDY OF HIS LIFE AND WORKS
AND OF HIS PLACE IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE.*
By Oral Sumner Coad, Ph.D. New York. The Dunlap Society. 1917. 8vo, pp. xiv, 315. 5 illustrations. 423 copies printed.

In this handsome volume, which maintains the traditions of the De Vinne Press, Dr. Coad, of Columbia University, has given us a comprehensive and interesting study of the first American dramatist of consequence. He has plowed into virgin soil. Save in Mrs. Annie Russell Marble's *Heralds of American Literature* (University of Chicago Press, 1907), pp. 235-75, and in Wegelin's bibliographical articles (in *The Literary Collector*, January, 1904, vii. 69-76, and in his *Early American Plays, 1714-1830*, The Dunlap Society, 1900, pp. 30-39), one will find but scant reference to Dunlap. Bronson (*Short History of American Literature*) gives him only a dozen lines; and Trent only a page and a quarter—though this is all, perhaps, that in such a work he deserves. Dr. Coad has filled, therefore, a real want.

Since Wegelin wrote, in 1904, the owner of the seven missing volumes of Dunlap's diary has been discovered, but he has been unwilling to allow Dr. Coad to see them. It is a pity the name of this person was not made known. If his object was to make scholarly use of these volumes himself, no one has any right to complain. But if his refusal was merely the act of a dog in the manger, then he ought to be pilloried along with the notorious hoarders of manuscripts and other such obstructors of scholarship.

Perhaps if any faults are to be specified in the volume, one might refer to some few sentences weak in emphasis, and might